

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
SAN DIEGO, CA

<i>Date:</i>	<i>June 21 San Diego</i> 1:00 – 5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	<i>San Diego</i> San Diego County Water Authority 4677 Overland Avenue,
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
<i>All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</i>			

Presenters:

Kamyar Guivetchi, Program Manager, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Julia Lee, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento

Cathy Pieroni, Advisory Committee member, City of San Diego

Mark Stuart, District Chief, Southern District, DWR

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee member Cathy Pieroni spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Southern District Chief Mark Stuart gave a presentation on the South Coast Regional Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for a traditional spoken comment period where individuals could address the audience with prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the background and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Cathy Pieroni explained the *Advisory Committee View*, which is a 4-page handout that summarizes the wide level of agreement and disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and the remaining areas of uncertainty.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + This Plan is a vast improvement over the past Water Plan., but wants more specifics. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Background is good. + Review of past documents – balance. + Hydrologic accounting. + Diversified integrated planning. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Document is too general. Δ Need to focus on what to do about the Delta and climate change problems. Δ Make the Water Plan closer to implementing agencies, devolve resources to them – some agencies like San Diego County well empowered, but others need more help from State. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Need more time to read the Water Plan. Δ Land use agencies regarding conservation of storm water runoff and protect groundwater. Δ State has responsibility for State Water Project. Key feature of State Water Project is the Delta. Without the Delta, we don't have State Water Project, poor water quality, seawater intrusion. DWR must be specific about strategies to take care of the Delta. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern: Not an Action Plan, detached from decision makers. • Maybe name “Strategic Plan” is incorrect, rather “Guiding Principles for a Water Plan” • High –level plan; how to discuss specific elements without involving CA Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)? • As a macro level document, how does the Plan facilitate decisions from decision makers? – “no substance” (pg. 2-12) • Where is funding? • Are we guided by the Water Code? • The State can make a Water Plan, but it can't implement it. • The state should make resources available to those entities that are responsible for making decisions • Global change is unknown; not sure if this is the best use of state funds • Climate change is occurring at rapid rate; the state should analyze climate change • How will DWR move water through the Delta if it is not maintained? • Is the intent of the Water Plan to be an action plan? • Will there be enough water – how does DWR come to its conclusion?

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will measure accountability? • Where does water development fit into the Framework for Action; it is unclear. • What is the role of government regarding catastrophic failures (i.e.) Delta, aqueducts. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment.
--	--	--

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and Southern District Chief Karl Mark Stuart summarized the Volume 3 regional reports for the South Coast region.

The Table Groups were given the opportunity to have table group discussions that this time, but the participants decided to skip this discussion session and to continue to the next presentation.

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several possible future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course or events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all. Each Region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

The Table Groups were given the opportunity to have table group discussions that this time, but the participants decided to skip this discussion session and to conclude the meeting.

Question & Answer Segment:

Q: What are the priorities for the different resource management strategies?

A: That is for the regions to decide. Not all regions have all 25 resource management strategies (desalination, conjunctive water management, surface storage, etc.) available to them. It may be unproductive for the State to signal priorities for one strategy from another in bond fund; that could put certain regions and communities at a disadvantage.

Another reason DWR does not prescribe which mix of strategies is best for which region is that the State still does not have the data and analytical tools or stakeholder agreement on the tools. DWR has a work plan for developing the appropriate analytical tools. Many tools have been developed as single purpose resource tools. Now we are trying to do integrated resource planning that considers the economics of water and demand.

For next Water Plan Update, DWR is thinking of having Advisory Committee members represent the various regional flavors, acting as liaisons with regional planning underway and statewide planning efforts. That way regional efforts could supply data and favorable regional mixes to statewide planning efforts. It would not be driven by DWR in Sacramento, but by local entities working together to find solutions that work best for them and the state.

Q: What assumptions were made for agricultural crop acreage in the future scenarios?

A: In the assumptions made for the three 2030 scenarios, there were assumptions about not only the acres of crops, but also the crop mix. At the same time, the State Water Plan does not signal or tell farmers what crops to grow. Crop decisions are market driven, and DWR is not in a position to make such recommendations. There is legislation, AB 2587, that requires the CA Department of Food and Agriculture to come up with a food forecast for 2030 for California, under certain criteria, to maintain the current export/import ratio. DWR has not received that food forecast, and DWR will not do a water estimate without that food forecast. It is something DWR has committed to do as soon as we receive a food forecast. In the interim, DWR worked with the UC Agricultural Issues Center. There is an article in the Volume 4 Reference Guide by Dr. Howitt and his colleagues on this issue. Absent a food forecast, they approached this issue using an economic approach based on world food market trends. The report concludes that the types of crops grown in California will change, but the value and economic productivity will continue to rise.

Q: In the South Coast, we had Metropolitan Water District and San Diego County Authority to take care of much of the planning aspects. Are there other agencies in other regions to take can take on that role as regional integrated planning starting happening around the state?

A: Yes, to different degrees. The Water Plan tries to document the different integrated planning efforts and recognizes more should be done in the future. In Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, the Water Plan identifies regional efforts that DWR knows about. We may be missing some, if so, please let us know. The general understanding is that Southern California has been the leading edge in integrated regional planning, particularly in terms of the number of agencies involved. DWR recognizes that some regions have less capacity to do regional planning and recommends that the State provide technical assistance. Proposition 50 Chapter 8 funding is providing incentives for more of this activity.

Q: Did you do a sensitivity analysis to identify which scenario assumptions might be most important in influencing the final results?

A: Yes and what was done is documented in the Volume 4 Reference Guide. However, DWR did not go through every parameter to come up with a sensitivity analysis. We came up with estimates for the input assumptions. Staff worked with David Groves at RAND to come up with *initial* estimates.

As part of this Water Plan framework, DWR wants to make the data and tools available to regions. The tool developed to do the water demand estimates is in the public domain, available in both a spreadsheet format and in a software called Analytica. Agencies can take the tool, toggle the assumptions and see how they affect them. DWR is not the gate keeper. DWR intends to help develop these tools, disseminate them to have them tested, improved, and used in the future.

Q: Does the DWR have a responsibility to expand the State Water Project to meet its original contract goal?

A: The State Water Project is continuing to improve its efficiency. As part of the CALFED Program, several aspects are going forward. DWR is doing the Tehachapi Afterbay project to help with energy aspects of pumping. The South Delta Improvement Program includes the increased pumping from the Delta to 8500 cfs to increase delivery capabilities. The South Delta Improvement Project EIR should be on the streets next month or so.

The Water Plan does address this. Within the 25 resource management strategies, there is the concept of improving state and federal water projects. There are two Initiatives in Water Plan's Framework for Action. The second Initiative is that we need to improve our statewide water management systems. That is where improving the capacity of the State Water Project fits within the Plan.

Q: Is there a delineation between the California Water Plan and the State Water Project.

A: Yes. DWR has eight high level goals in its department strategic plan. One of those goals is to operate the State Water Project. Much of its staff and resources are assigned to this task. However, DWR has other important missions not under the auspices of the State Water Project, including the California Water Plan Update, emergency services, local assistance, and flood management. They are related and affect one another, but they are not part of the State Water Project.

Part 4 Additional Public Comments

- 3-D "Cylinders" water supply & use graphic hard to read in the Water Portfolios in the *Highlights* document. You cannot read the gradient.

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. No members of the public registered to speak.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar and Austin thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Gary Arant, Valley Center Municipal Water District
Harold Bailey, Padre Dam Municipal Water District
Sarah Beckman, Shea Homes
Marilyn Dailey, San Diego Water County Authority Director
Bill DuBois, California Farm Bureau Federation
Dana Frieauf, San Diego County Water Authority
William Granger, Otay Water District
Bob Greaney, Carlsbad Municipal Water District
Kim Horner, Olivenhain Municipal Water District
Susan Hunt, Office of the Speaker of the California Assembly
Ed Kimura, Sierra Club
Patti Krebs, IEA
Keith Lewinger, Fallbrook Public Utility District
Jerry Livingston, SD BIA
Armin Munevar, CH2M Hill
Doug Sain, Multi-housing Laundry Association
Rainey Selamet, Public
Jeff Stephenson, San Diego County Water Authority
M. R. Welch, Public
Anderw Zingale, California State Assembly

Staff:

Glenn Berquist, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Robert Fastenau, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
David Inouye, DWR
Linda Inouye, DWR
Vern Knoop, DWR
Julia Lee, CCP
Mark Stuart, DWR
David Sumi, CCP